

Results of Molecular Genetics Laboratory User Satisfaction Survey Report 2008

Breast cancer

4/7 responses were received – initially only two responses were received from the first round of 5 users contacted so a further two users were selected.

1) Reporting times

Reporting times rating - average 4.5/5

All respondents were happy that reporting times met their clinic needs.

2) Reporting practice

All respondents thought the wording was “about right” and one general comment was made that reporting “has been developed in discussion with clinical staff.” Another comment was made that “different reports (reporting similar results) are done in different formats which can be confusing.”

3) Mutation nomenclature

No respondents were confused by the mutation nomenclature change that was applied to all reports in 2006. All were happy to have three letter amino acid codes (two suggested that both would be helpful but verbal communication with one has suggested that to have three letter codes is sufficient).

4) Referral criteria and gatekeeping

All users consulted use Manchester criteria (>17) and the Royal Marsden use BOADICEA in addition

5) Information

Two users were aware of the Laboratory website (www.southwestthamesgenetics.nhs.uk)

Information regarding sample sending rating – average 4.75/5.

Advice from staff rating – average 5/5

Two comments were made that “the new email system [medgen@stgeorges.nhs.uk] is fantastic” and “excellent.”

6) Overall quality of service

Overall service rating – average 4.88/5

Comments were made regarding the efficiency of the service and the helpfulness of staff involved.

Conclusions

The outcomes of the survey were discussed at a short BRCA service review meeting held 19th January 2009. The Laboratory is currently reporting to CMGS Best Practice Guidelines and consistently performs well in UKNEQAS schemes, and acknowledges that reporting formats and nomenclature changes can sometimes be confusing. It was decided that no changes were necessary to the service or reporting practice at this time, based on the overall responses.

The comment regarding different reports in different formats was followed up by telephone with the user. Changes have been made to the way in which variants are reported in the body of the report text which has led to some confusion and also a lack of consistency. These changes were made as the CMGS best practice guidelines were being issued and as a result of other factors. However, there are no further issues regarding variant reporting and the user was assured that no further changes to the reporting style are currently planned.

Many thanks to all colleagues who took part in our survey.

WILL KING
Quality Manager